

RANDALL S. NEWMAN (SBN 190547)
Attorney at Law
99 Wall St., Suite 3727
New York, NY 10005
212.797.3735
rsn@randallnewman.net

*Attorney for Plaintiff,
Liberty Troll LLC*

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN JOSE DIVISION**

LIBERTY TROLL LLC,

Case No. 25-cv-06100-TLT

Plaintiff,

HON. TRINA L. THOMPSON

vs

**AMENDED COMPLAINT
FOR:**

GAIL BUMA,

Defendant.

1. Misrepresentation, 17 U.S.C. § 512(f);

2. Declaration of Copyright Infringement

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

1 Plaintiff, Liberty Troll LLC (“Plaintiff”), files this action against Gail Buma
2 (“Buma”) and alleges as follows:

3 **INTRODUCTION**

4 1. This case is about the widespread abuse of the Digital Millennium Copyright
5 Act’s counter-notice process by individuals seeking to keep infringing “reaction channel”
6 videos monetized on the YouTube platform.

7 2. Over the past several years, a growing number of YouTube channel creators
8 have built their channels on the unauthorized use of copyrighted footage from creators who
9 actually produce original content. These channels repost others’ work without permission,
10 add little or no transformation, and monetize the stolen material through YouTube’s Partner
11 Program under the guise of “fair use.”

12 3. While some “reaction” videos have been upheld as fair use, courts have
13 emphasized that such videos must include structured critique, frequent interjections, and a
14 transformative purpose. This case involves an emerging model of “mockumentary-style”
15 infringement in which the so-called “creator” splices Plaintiff’s original footage with short
16 video clips purely to mock and ridicule, believing that stacking multiple layers of
17 infringement somehow adds up to fair use. This emerging tactic weaponizes copyright law
18 itself, presenting layers of ridicule as transformative use, while hiding behind anonymous
19 accounts and DMCA counter-notices.

20 4. When copyright owners like Plaintiff submit takedown notices under 17
21 U.S.C. § 512(c), these infringing channels often retaliate by filing counter-notices under §
22 512(g), swearing under penalty of perjury that their use is protected by fair use.

23 5. Many of these counter-notices are false. They are submitted by individuals
24 who have not reviewed the videos, do not understand the law, or are gambling that the
25 copyright owner will not bother to sue.

26 6. The abuse has become so rampant that anonymous creators now enlist random
27 people to file false counter-notices on their behalf. Creators have resorted to outsourcing
28

perjury, recruiting unknowing or complicit third parties to submit counter-notices in their names, often without even watching the disputed content.

7. In this case, Buma, an individual purportedly living in New Jersey, submitted eight counter-notices (the “Counter-Notices”) on behalf of a channel known as “Dr. Dave Debunker of Frauditors!” (“Dr. Dave”), <https://www.youtube.com/@drdavedebunker> (the “Dr. Dave Channel”).

8. The Counter-Notices covered eight videos (the “8-Videos”) that appeared on the Dr. Dave Channel using Plaintiff’s copyrighted footage.

9. The 8-Videos consist of two short-videos and six long-form videos.

10. In each counter-notice, Buma made multiple statements under penalty of perjury in order to have YouTube restore the 8-Videos.

11. Over the span of four months, Buma submitted the eight Counter-Notices using the exact same boilerplate justification, word for word, despite clear factual differences among the 8-Videos. This cookie-cutter approach underscores a deliberate scheme to preserve monetized content, not a genuine fair use assessment.

12. As alleged below, the Counter-Notices are materially false.

13. Plaintiff brings this action under 17 U.S.C. § 512(f) to hold Buma accountable for knowingly and materially misrepresenting the legal basis of the Counter-Notices, and to have the 8-Videos removed from the Dr. Dave Channel.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

14. This action arises under the Copyright Act, 17 U.S.C. § 101 *et seq.*, and includes a claim for Declaratory Relief under 28 U.S.C. § 2201.

15. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a).

16. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Buma because she purposefully directed her conduct toward this District by submitting the Counter-Notices to YouTube, a company headquartered in this District, knowing that the alleged infringement dispute would be processed, reviewed, and acted upon here. Buma knew or should have known

1 that YouTube's copyright enforcement operations occur primarily in the Northern District
2 of California, and that YouTube would rely on her sworn statements in determining
3 whether to reinstate the videos at issue. By initiating the counter-notice process under 17
4 U.S.C. § 512(g), Buma purposefully caused effects in this District sufficient to establish
5 specific personal jurisdiction.

6 17. Venue is proper in this District under 28 U.S.C. § 1331(b)(2) and 28 U.S.C. §
7 1400(a) because a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claim
8 occurred in this District, including YouTube's reliance on the false Counter-Notices to
9 reinstate the infringing content.

10 **PARTIES**

11 18. Plaintiff is a Florida limited liability company and the sole owner of the
12 copyrights in the videos published on the YouTube channel "Liberty Troll"
13 (@LibertyTroll).

14 19. Buma is an individual purportedly living in Delran, New Jersey who claimed
15 in the Counter-Notices that she operates the Dr. Dave Channel.

16 20. The Dr. Dave Channel is a textbook example of an anonymous "reaction"
17 channel—that is, a channel that creates no original content of its own (or very little in this
18 case), but instead lifts copyrighted footage from others, overlays superficial or token
19 commentary, and attempts to pass it off as transformative. Buma never appears on camera,
20 and it was not publicly known that she claimed to own and operate the Dr. Dave Channel.
21 The channel's anonymity has served as both sword and shield, permitting targeted
22 harassment of real creators while shielding the actual operator from liability

23 21. Buma claims that the Dr. Dave Channel exists to expose "1st Amendment
24 Frauditors who are grifters and con men..." In reality, the channel monetizes stolen footage
25 from those very same people, ironically engaging in the exact behavior Buma purports to
26 criticize. It is not journalism. It is not commentary. It is copyright infringement disguised
27 as fair use, wrapped in a mask of moral outrage.

28

1 **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

2 22. YouTube is the largest video-sharing platform in the world and operates under
 3 the framework established by the Digital Millennium Copyright Act (“DMCA”), 17 U.S.C.
 4 § 512.

5 23. The DMCA provides a process by which copyright owners may request the
 6 removal of infringing content through a notice-and-takedown mechanism. If the platform
 7 receives a valid takedown notice, it typically disables access to the allegedly infringing
 8 material.

9 24. The DMCA also allows the alleged infringer to submit a counter-notification
 10 claiming that the use is authorized, lawful, or otherwise non-infringing. If the copyright
 11 owner does not initiate a federal lawsuit within 10 business days of receiving a counter-
 12 notice, YouTube is required by law to restore access to the disputed content pursuant to 17
 13 U.S.C. § 512(g).

14 25. This statutory framework places the burden on copyright owners, particularly
 15 small independent creators and small publishers, to enforce their rights through litigation.

16 26. Infringers such as the Dr. Dave Channel exploit this imbalance by targeting
 17 small creators who lack the resources to initiate a lawsuit after receiving a counter-notice.

18 27. In practice, this loophole allows anonymous, monetized YouTube channels to
 19 exploit copyrighted material by falsely invoking “fair use” without consequence or
 20 oversight. This asymmetry allows reaction channels to weaponize the DMCA’s procedural
 21 safeguards against the very creators the statute was designed to protect.

22 28. In recent years, “fair use” has become a catchall defense on YouTube—used
 23 not to support legitimate critique, but to excuse the wholesale misappropriation of others’
 24 creative work.

25 **Auditors v. Auditor Trolls**

26 29. The auditor community on YouTube consists of small independent content
 27 creators who film interactions with government officials in public spaces to promote
 28 transparency and assert constitutional rights, primarily the First Amendment. These

1 creators act as citizen journalists, watchdogs, and public advocates, documenting real-time
 2 government conduct and holding public officials accountable through video (the
 3 “Auditor(s)”). These creators perform a constitutionally significant role in the modern
 4 digital public square, documenting state actors, enforcing transparency, and shaping public
 5 debate.

6 30. The Auditor movement has grown into a powerful and controversial force on
 7 social media. Auditors regularly publish their videos to YouTube channels, where they
 8 have collectively attracted millions of subscribers and billions of views. These creators
 9 often operate under channel names or aliases and have become recognizable figures in the
 10 digital civil rights ecosystem.

11 31. A genre of YouTube creators known as “Auditor Trolls” has emerged in
 12 response. These “creators” produce reaction-style videos targeting Auditors. Their focus is
 13 ridicule, not critique. Though cloaked in the trappings of critique, these videos rely on
 14 insult, derision, and misrepresentation, rather than substance or commentary.

15 32. The Dr. Dave Channel is a textbook example of such misuse. It provides no
 16 new message, no added insight, and no transformation of purpose. It simply repackages
 17 Plaintiff’s footage with occasional ridicule to attract viewers and generate revenue from
 18 Plaintiff’s content. The Dr. Dave Channel creates very little original content of its own.
 19 Most of the videos on the Dr. Dave Channel consist of Auditors’ videos that were
 20 downloaded in violation of YouTube’s Terms of Service and spliced together for ad
 21 revenue.

22 33. These additions rarely engage with the subject matter or journalistic value of
 23 Plaintiff’s works. Instead, the Dr. Dave Channel mocks Auditors personally—their voices,
 24 mannerisms, appearances, emotional reactions, and private lives.

25 34. The Dr. Dave Channel has created numerous videos using Plaintiff’s
 26 copyrighted footage without permission.

27 35. In May and September 2024, Plaintiff’s assignor submitted DMCA takedown
 28 notices with YouTube pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 512(c), identifying eight infringing videos,

1 specifically, two short-form videos and six long-form videos, published on the Dr. Dave
 2 Channel.

3 36. YouTube complied and temporarily removed the 8-Videos pending resolution
 4 of the dispute. A list of the URLs for the 8-Videos that were removed, or later made private,
 5 by the Dr. Dave Channel is attached hereto as **Exhibit A**.

6 37. On or about May 14, 2024, Buma submitted two identical counter-notices to
 7 YouTube pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 512(g)(3). Each counter-notice included the following
 8 sworn statement:

9 **My** video should be reinstated because it falls under The Fair Use Act of 1976.

10 Furthermore, **I** have researched copyright law extensively and YouTube
 11 cannot determine what is Fair Use and what is not. Only a duly appointed
 12 Judge can make that determination, and **I** am prepared to go to court to
 13 challenge this claim. In accordance with The Fair Use Act of 1976¹, **I** am
 14 legally permitted to create this type of video. **I** operate a commentary channel
 15 where **I** provide reviews of videos by 1st Amendment auditors, adding voice
 16 commentary, memes and sound effects to completely transform the original
 17 work into a Fair Use Video. Furthermore, **my video** falls under Fair Use due
 18 to use of criticism, review, caricature and parody. In addition, **I** used a fraction
 19 of the original content and transformed the original content into my own
 20 unique work. No reasonable person could watch **my video** and mistake it for
 21 the original. Moreover, **I** am willing to defend myself in a court of law, having
 22 hired an attorney to litigate the erroneous charge lodged by the claimant.
 23 Please forward my counter notification to the claimant so he may decide for
 24 himself if he chooses to take legal action in defense of his false claim. Thank
 25 you.

26
 27
 28 ¹ Buma claims that she “researched copyright law extensively” yet cites the non-existent “Fair Use Act
 of 1976”.

1 I swear, under penalty of perjury, that I have a good faith belief the material
2 was removed due to a mistake or misidentification of the material to be
3 removed or disabled. (emphasis added).

4 38. Buma filed the exact same counter-notice in response to six subsequent
5 DMCA takedown notices on May 19, 2024, May 26, 2024, June 11, 2024, two on
6 September 21, 2024, and September 25, 2024. All of them contained the identical language
7 that Buma used in the two May 14, 2024, counter-notices. A copy of all 8 Counter-Notices
8 are attached as **Exhibit B**.

9 39. In all eight Counter-Notices, Buma swore under penalty of perjury that the
10 videos were removed “by mistake or misidentification” and that: 1) she operated the Dr.
11 Dave Channel; 2) she researched copyright law extensively; 3) she was prepared to go to
12 court to challenge Plaintiff’s claim of infringement; 4) she added voice commentary; and
13 5) she transformed Plaintiff’s videos into her “own unique work”.

14 40. Based upon information and belief, these assertions were materially false.

15 41. It is believed that Buma has nothing to do with the operation of the Dr. Dave
16 Channel and that channel is operated by an individual residing in Ohio by the name of
17 David Coulter (“Coulter”). In fact, Coulter admitted that he operates the Dr. Dave Channel
18 on a livestream recorded on July 12, 2025. This admission directly contradicts every
19 counter-notice submitted under Buma’s name and supports the inference that Buma’s
20 involvement was fabricated, coerced, or deliberately misused to bypass YouTube’s
21 enforcement mechanisms.

22 42. *Based upon information and belief, Coulter is banned from owning and/or
23 operating a YouTube channel because of previous violations of YouTube’s Terms of
24 Service.*

25 43. Based upon information and belief, Buma (if she exists) is an elderly woman
26 residing in New Jersey who has no actual involvement with the creation, editing, or
27 operation of the Dr. Dave YouTube Channel or its associated content. It is believed that
28

Coulter either fraudulently used Buma's name on the Counter-Notices or convinced Buma to put the Dr. Dave Channel in her name as a way to avoid his YouTube ban.

44. It is therefore plausible, and indeed likely, that Coulter submitted the Counter-Notices himself while fraudulently using Buma's name to evade personal liability and mislead YouTube's enforcement systems. If true, this conduct constitutes a willful and material misrepresentation under § 512(f), and may also violate other federal and state laws, including those governing perjury and identity fraud.

45. The two short videos consist entirely of Plaintiff's copyrighted footage. There is not a single word of narration, commentary, or critique in these videos, directly contradicting Buma's claim that she added "voice commentary."

46. The six long videos consist of long stretches of Plaintiff's works dispersed with periodic insults that do not transform the works, directly contradicting Buma's claims that she completely transformed the works into Fair Use Videos.

47. Despite these clear deficiencies, Buma submitted eight identical counter-notices during a four-month period that contain knowingly false statements.

48. The Counter-Notices were part of a coordinated scheme to preserve monetized infringing content while appearing to conceal the identity of the true channel operator (David Coulter). Buma submitted the false Counter-Notices under penalty of perjury as required by 17 U.S.C. § 512(g).

49. Plaintiff now seeks damages, attorneys' fees, declaratory and injunctive relief for Buma's material misrepresentations in the Counter-Notices submitted to YouTube.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

Misrepresentation in Counter-Notifications under the DMCA

(17 U.S.C. § 512(f))

50. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations set forth in Paragraphs 1 through 49.

1 51. Section 512(f)(2) of the Copyright Act provides, in relevant part, that “any
 2 person who knowingly materially misrepresents under this section . . . that material was
 3 removed or disabled by mistake or misidentification, shall be liable for any damages,
 4 including costs and attorneys’ fees, incurred by the alleged infringer, by any copyright
 5 owner...who is injured by such misrepresentation...” (emphasis added).

6 52. Despite swearing under penalty of perjury, Buma’s Counter-Notices included
 7 wholesale fabrications, betraying a coordinated attempt to manipulate the takedown
 8 process.

9 53. The Counter-Notices submitted by Buma were false, and knowingly so at the
 10 time they were filed.

11 54. Buma falsely represented, under penalty of perjury, the following: (a) that she
 12 created and posted the 8-Videos (she did not); (b) that the videos “fall” under The Fair
 13 Use Act of 1976 (a non-existent law); (c) that Buma operates the @DrDaveDebunker
 14 YouTube channel (she does not); (d) that Buma was prepared to go to court to challenge
 15 Plaintiff’s takedown notices; (e) that Buma added commentary, memes and sound effects
 16 to Plaintiff’s videos (she did not); (f) that Buma’s use of the videos constitutes fair use; (g)
 17 that Buma only used a fraction of Plaintiff’s videos; and (h) that Buma transformed the
 18 videos into her own unique work; (i) that Buma hired an attorney to defend herself in court;
 19 and (j) that Buma had a good faith belief that Defendants’ videos were removed due to a
 20 mistake or misidentification of the material to be removed or disabled.

21 55. As alleged above, these statements were materially false.

22 56. Buma made these knowingly false statements in an effort to preserve or re-
 23 monetize the 8-Videos on the Dr. Dave Channel.

24 57. As a direct result of Buma’s material misrepresentations, Plaintiff was forced
 25 to initiate this action to have the 8-Videos removed from the Dr. Dave Channel. Plaintiff
 26 is entitled to recover damages, costs, and attorneys’ fees under 17 U.S.C. § 512(f).

27 58. Plaintiff is further entitled to injunctive relief requiring YouTube or its agents
 28 to remove the 8-Videos from the Dr. Dave Channel.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

Declaration of Copyright Infringement, 28 U.S.C. § 2201

59. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations set forth in Paragraphs 1 through 58.

60. An actual and justiciable controversy exists between Plaintiff and Buma concerning the Dr. Dave Channel's use of the 8-Videos.

61. Plaintiff contends that the Dr. Dave Channel's use of the 8-Videos is not protected under 17 U.S.C. § 107.

62. Buma asserts that her use of the 8-Videos is protected by 17 U.S.C. § 107 as she stated in the Counter-Notifications.

63. Plaintiff seeks a judicial declaration under 28 U.S.C. § 2201 that the Dr. Dave Channel's use of the 8-Videos is not protected by 17 U.S.C. § 107.

64. Plaintiff also seeks an injunction requiring YouTube to remove the six videos that remain on the Dr. Dave Channel and restrain YouTube from restoring the two videos that the Dr. Dave Channel made private as listed on **Exhibit A**.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, Liberty Troll LLC, prays for judgment against Buma as follows:

- A. That judgment be entered in favor of Plaintiff and against Buma for monetary damages caused by her knowing material misrepresentations in the Counter-Notices pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 512(f);
- B. That the Court enter a declaratory judgment that the Dr. Dave Channel's use of the 8-Videos is not protected by 17 U.S.C. § 107;
- C. A permanent injunction enjoining the Dr. Dave Channel and any related channel from further use of the 8-Videos and requiring YouTube to remove the 8-Videos and prevent further dissemination;
- D. An award of attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 512(f)(2);
- E. Any other relief the Court deems just and proper.

1 **JURY TRIAL DEMANDED**
2
3

Dated: August 25, 2025

4 /s/ Randall S. Newman
5 Randall S. Newman, Esq. (SBN 190547)
6 99 Wall Street, Suite 3727
7 New York, NY 10005
8 (212) 797-3735
9 rsn@randallnewman.net

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Attorney for Plaintiff,
Liberty Troll, LLC

EXHIBIT A - LIST OF URLs SUBJECT TO THE EIGHT COUNTERCLAIMS

	Date of Counter	YouTube "Case No"	Infringing Video	Status	Long/Short
1	5/14/2024	C7UTT7P5PTVPG7EHO4QRLTB5M	http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=lnFQ3EqIsms	Private	Long
2	5/14/2024	WTEU3LFVVCQSPNBZQKBGQ4DL3A	http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vQ9TL-GYicQ	Live	Long
3	5/19/2024	VZX4KT6PUZMPDMCXFDAVWUSZFI	http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5y1ZIL13D9c	Private	Long
4	5/26/2024	NYOGXWIPVL453KQY44EQKDAEUI	http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gqehXCoAYpE	Live	Long
5	6/11/2024	RARWYZKY6X6OLE3VS4LUNCCMDM	http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=lCyGYGN4qhM	Live	Short
6	9/21/2024	J46MOTK4CTOQLM2SQ34AWU2TDI	http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=a-unkxptlMA	Live	Long
7	9/21/2024	WSULUOAZ3LEHPXFEH2MRWXIKW4	http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Xcj7eozlgyQ	Live	Long
8	9/25/2024	AED5AZF3PF2UHIWGN7HHEQH2D4	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Tl6OVNs0ua8	Live	Short



Re: [C7UTT7P5PTVPGR7EHO4QRLTB5M] New Copyright Counter Notification

From YouTube Copyright <youtube-disputes+1zmud47xquo180h@google.com>

Date Tue 5/14/2024 10:53 PM

To zkueker88@gmail.com <zkueker88@gmail.com>



We received a counter notification (below) in response to a copyright removal request that you submitted. A counter notification is a legal request for YouTube to reinstate a video that was removed due to a copyright removal request.

You have **10 US business days** to reply to this counter notification. Your response **must include evidence that you've taken legal action against the uploader** to keep the content from being reinstated to YouTube. Usually, evidence would include a lawsuit against the uploader, which names the YouTube URL(s) at issue and seeks a court order to restrain the alleged infringement.

Evidence should be submitted by replying directly to this email. Do not send your reply to copyright@youtube.com.

After 10 US business days, if we don't get a response from you, the content at issue may be reinstated to YouTube. You can find more information about the legal action you must take and what evidence is acceptable in our [Help Center](#).

- The YouTube Team

Counter Notification as follows:

Videos included in counter notification:

- <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=lnFQ3EqIsms>

Display name of uploader: Dr. Dave Debunker of Frauditors!

My video should be reinstated because it falls under The Fair Use Act of 1976. Furthermore, I have researched copyright law extensively and YouTube cannot determine what is Fair Use and what is not. Only a duly appointed Judge can make that determination, and I am prepared to go to court to challenge this claim. In accordance with The Fair Use Act of 1976, I am legally permitted to create this type of video. I operate a commentary channel where I provide reviews of videos by 1st Amendment auditors, adding voice commentary, memes and sound effects to completely transform the original work into a Fair Use Video. Furthermore, my

video fall under Fair Use due to use of criticism, review, caricature and parody. In addition, I used a fraction of the original content and transformed the original content into my own unique work. No reasonable person could watch my video and mistake it for the original. Moreover, I am willing to defend myself in a court of law, having hired an attorney to litigate the erroneous charge lodged by the claimant. Please forward my counter notification to the claimant so he may decide for himself if he chooses to take legal action in defense of his false claim. Thank you.

I swear, under penalty of perjury, that I have a good faith belief the material was removed due to a mistake or misidentification of the material to be removed or disabled.

I consent to the jurisdiction of the Federal District Court for the district in which my address is located, or if my address is outside of the United States, the judicial district in which YouTube is located, and will accept service of process from the claimant.

Gail Buma

Gail Buma
4 Ashley Drive
Delran, New Jersey 08075
United States

gailbuma3@gmail.com

(856) 256-1727

[Help Center](#) • [Email Options](#)

You received this email to provide information and updates around your YouTube channel or account.



© 2021 [Google LLC d/b/a YouTube, 901 Cherry Ave, San Bruno, CA 94066](#)



Re: [WTEU3LFVVCQSPNBZQKBGQ4DL3A] New Copyright Counter-Notification

From YouTube Copyright <youtube-disputes+1sxtw9yu2iupn0h@google.com>

Date Wed 5/29/2024 3:22 PM

To zkueker88@gmail.com <zkueker88@gmail.com>



Under Section 512(g) of the Digital Millennium Copyright Act, we received a counter notification in response to a copyright removal request that you submitted. In accordance with US law, we've reinstated these videos to YouTube:

- <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vQ9TL-GYicQ>

You can learn more about your options for responding to a counter notification in our Help Center. You may also choose to pursue the matter directly with the uploader.

- The YouTube Team

[Help Center](#) • [Email Options](#)

You received this email to provide information and updates around your YouTube channel or account.



© 2021 Google LLC d/b/a YouTube, 901 Cherry Ave, San Bruno, CA 94066

On May 14, 2024 YouTube Copyright



We received a counter notification (below) in response to a copyright removal request that you submitted. A counter notification is a legal request for YouTube to reinstate a video that was removed due to a copyright removal request.

You have **10 US business days** to reply to this counter notification. Your response **must include evidence that you've taken legal action against the uploader** to keep the content from being reinstated to YouTube. Usually, evidence would include a lawsuit against the uploader, which names the YouTube URL(s) at issue and seeks a court order to restrain the alleged infringement.

Evidence should be submitted by replying directly to this email. Do not send your reply to copyright@youtube.com.

After 10 US business days, if we don't get a response from you, the content at issue may be reinstated to YouTube. You can find more information about the legal action you must take and what evidence is acceptable in our [Help Center](#).

- The YouTube Team

Counter Notification as follows:

Videos included in counter notification:

- <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vQ9TL-GYicQ>

Display name of uploader: Dr. Dave Debunker of Frauditors!

My video should be reinstated because it falls under The Fair Use Act of 1976. Furthermore, I have researched copyright law extensively and YouTube cannot determine what is Fair Use and what is not. Only a duly appointed Judge can make that determination, and I am prepared to go to court to challenge this claim. In accordance with The Fair Use Act of 1976, I am legally permitted to create this type of video. I operate a commentary channel where I provide reviews of videos by 1st Amendment auditors, adding voice commentary, memes and sound effects to completely transform the original work into a Fair Use Video. Furthermore, my video fall under Fair Use due to use of criticism, review, caricature and parody. In addition, I used a fraction of the original content and transformed the original content into my own unique work. No reasonable person could watch my video and mistake it for the original. Moreover, I am willing to defend myself in a court of law, having hired an attorney to litigate the erroneous charge lodged by the claimant. Please forward my counter notification to the claimant so he may decide for himself if he chooses to take legal action in defense of his false claim. Thank you.

I swear, under penalty of perjury, that I have a good faith belief the material was removed due to a mistake or misidentification of the material to be removed or disabled.

I consent to the jurisdiction of the Federal District Court for the district in which my address is located, or if my address is outside of the United States, the judicial district in which YouTube is located, and will accept service of process from the claimant.

Gail Buma

Gail Buma
4 Ashley Drive
Delran, New Jersey 08075
United States

gailbuma3@gmail.com

(856) 296-1727

[Help Center](#) • [Email Options](#)

You received this email to provide information and updates around your YouTube channel or account.



© 2021 [Google LLC d/b/a YouTube, 901 Cherry Ave, San Bruno, CA 94066](#)



Re: [VZX4KT6PUZMPDMCXFDAVWUSZFI] New Copyright Counter Notification

From YouTube Copyright <youtube-disputes+2cicu1nzm38rd0h@google.com>

Date Sun 5/19/2024 11:29 AM

To zkueker88@gmail.com <zkueker88@gmail.com>



We received a counter notification (below) in response to a copyright removal request that you submitted. A counter notification is a legal request for YouTube to reinstate a video that was removed due to a copyright removal request.

You have **10 US business days** to reply to this counter notification. Your response **must include evidence that you've taken legal action against the uploader** to keep the content from being reinstated to YouTube. Usually, evidence would include a lawsuit against the uploader, which names the YouTube URL(s) at issue and seeks a court order to restrain the alleged infringement.

Evidence should be submitted by replying directly to this email. Do not send your reply to copyright@youtube.com.

After 10 US business days, if we don't get a response from you, the content at issue may be reinstated to YouTube. You can find more information about the legal action you must take and what evidence is acceptable in our [Help Center](#).

- The YouTube Team

Counter Notification as follows:

Videos included in counter notification:

- <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5y1ZIL13D9c>

Display name of uploader: Dr. Dave Debunker of Frauditors!

My video should be reinstated because it falls under The Fair Use Act of 1976. Furthermore, I have researched copyright law extensively and YouTube cannot determine what is Fair Use and what is not. Only a duly appointed Judge can make that determination, and I am prepared to go to court to challenge this claim. In accordance with The Fair Use Act of 1976, I am legally permitted to create this type of video. I operate a commentary channel where I provide reviews of videos by 1st Amendment auditors, adding voice commentary, memes and sound effects to completely transform the original work into a Fair Use Video. Furthermore, my

video fall under Fair Use due to use of criticism, review, caricature and parody. In addition, I used a fraction of the original content and transformed the original content into my own unique work. No reasonable person could watch my video and mistake it for the original. Moreover, I am willing to defend myself in a court of law, having hired an attorney to litigate the erroneous charge lodged by the claimant. Please forward my counter notification to the claimant so he may decide for himself if he chooses to take legal action in defense of his false claim. Thank you.

I swear, under penalty of perjury, that I have a good faith belief the material was removed due to a mistake or misidentification of the material to be removed or disabled.

I consent to the jurisdiction of the Federal District Court for the district in which my address is located, or if my address is outside of the United States, the judicial district in which YouTube is located, and will accept service of process from the claimant.

Gail Buma

Gail Buma
4 Ashley Drive
Delran, New Jersey 08075
United States

gailbuma3@gmail.com

(856) 256-1727

[Help Center](#) • [Email Options](#)

You received this email to provide information and updates around your YouTube channel or account.



© 2021 [Google LLC d/b/a YouTube, 901 Cherry Ave, San Bruno, CA 94066](#)



Outlook

Re: [NYOGXWIPVL453KQY44EQKDAEUI] New Copyright Counter-Notification

From YouTube Copyright <youtube-disputes+2jrx1ez6ju9dl0h@google.com>

Date Fri 10/4/2024 10:44 AM

To zkueker88@gmail.com <zkueker88@gmail.com>



Under Section 512(g) of the Digital Millennium Copyright Act, we received a counter notification in response to a copyright removal request that you submitted. In accordance with US law, we've reinstated these videos to YouTube:

- <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gqehXCoAYpE>

You can learn more about your options for responding to a counter notification in our Help Center. You may also choose to pursue the matter directly with the uploader.

- The YouTube Team

[Help Center](#) • [Email Options](#)

You received this email to provide information and updates around your YouTube channel or account.



© 2021 Google LLC d/b/a YouTube, 901 Cherry Ave, San Bruno, CA 94066

On Sep 20, 2024 YouTube Copyright



We received a counter notification (below) in response to a copyright removal request that you submitted. A counter notification is a legal request for YouTube to reinstate a video that was removed due to a copyright removal request.

You have **10 US business days** to reply to this counter notification. Your response **must include evidence that you've taken legal action against the uploader** to keep the content from being reinstated to YouTube. Usually, evidence would include a lawsuit against the uploader, which names the YouTube URL(s) at issue and seeks a court order to restrain the alleged infringement.

Evidence should be submitted by replying directly to this email. Do not send your reply to copyright@youtube.com.

After 10 US business days, if we don't get a response from you, the content at issue may be reinstated to YouTube. You can find more information about the legal action you must take and what evidence is acceptable in our [Help Center](#).

- The YouTube Team

Counter Notification as follows:

Videos included in counter notification:

- <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gqehXCoAYpE>

Display name of uploader: Dr. Dave Debunker of Frauditors!

My video should be reinstated because it falls under The Fair Use Act of 1976. Furthermore, I have researched copyright law extensively and YouTube cannot determine what is Fair Use and what is not. Only a duly appointed Judge can make that determination, and I am prepared to go to court to challenge this claim. In accordance with The Fair Use Act of 1976, I am legally permitted to create this type of video. I operate a commentary channel where I provide reviews of videos by 1st Amendment auditors, adding voice commentary, memes and sound effects to completely transform the original work into a Fair Use Video. Furthermore, my video falls under Fair Use due to use of criticism, review, caricature and parody. In addition, I used a fraction of the original content and transformed the original content into my own unique work. No reasonable person could watch my video and mistake it for the original. Moreover, I am willing to defend myself in a court of law, having hired an attorney to litigate the erroneous charge lodged by the claimant. Please forward my counter notification to the claimant so he may decide for himself if he chooses to take legal action in defense of his false claim. Thank you.

I swear, under penalty of perjury, that I have a good faith belief the material was removed due to a mistake or misidentification of the material to be removed or disabled.

I consent to the jurisdiction of the Federal District Court for the district in which my address is located, or if my address is outside of the United States, the judicial district in which YouTube is located, and will accept service of process from the claimant.

Gail Buma

Gail Buma
4 Ashley Drive
Delran, New Jersey 08075
United States

gailbuma3@gmail.com

(856) 296-1727

[Help Center](#) • [Email Options](#)

You received this email to provide information and updates around your YouTube channel or account.



© 2021 [Google LLC d/b/a YouTube, 901 Cherry Ave, San Bruno, CA 94066](#)



Re: [RARWYZKY6X6OLE3VS4LUNCCMDM] New Copyright Counter-Notification

From YouTube Copyright <youtube-disputes+0s6bs56rql1z0h@google.com>

Date Tue 6/11/2024 2:00 PM

To zkueker88@gmail.com <zkueker88@gmail.com>



Under Section 512(g) of the Digital Millennium Copyright Act, we received a counter notification in response to a copyright removal request that you submitted. In accordance with US law, we've reinstated these videos to YouTube:

- <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ICyGYGN4qhM>

You can learn more about your options for responding to a counter notification in our Help Center. You may also choose to pursue the matter directly with the uploader.

- The YouTube Team

[Help Center](#) • [Email Options](#)

You received this email to provide information and updates around your YouTube channel or account.



© 2021 Google LLC d/b/a YouTube, 901 Cherry Ave, San Bruno, CA 94066

On May 26, 2024 YouTube Copyright



We received a counter notification (below) in response to a copyright removal request that you submitted. A counter notification is a legal request for YouTube to reinstate a video that was removed due to a copyright removal request.

You have **10 US business days** to reply to this counter notification. Your response **must include evidence that you've taken legal action against the uploader** to keep the content from being reinstated to YouTube. Usually, evidence would include a lawsuit against the uploader, which names the YouTube URL(s) at issue and seeks a court order to restrain the alleged infringement.

Evidence should be submitted by replying directly to this email. Do not send your reply to copyright@youtube.com.

After 10 US business days, if we don't get a response from you, the content at issue may be reinstated to YouTube. You can find more information about the legal action you must take and what evidence is acceptable in our [Help Center](#).

- The YouTube Team

Counter Notification as follows:

Videos included in counter notification:

- <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ICyGYGN4qhM>

Display name of uploader: Dr. Dave Debunker of Frauditors!

My video should be reinstated because it falls under The Fair Use Act of 1976. Furthermore, I have researched copyright law extensively and YouTube cannot determine what is Fair Use and what is not. Only a duly appointed Judge can make that determination, and I am prepared to go to court to challenge this claim. In accordance with The Fair Use Act of 1976, I am legally permitted to create this type of video. I operate a commentary channel where I provide reviews of videos by 1st Amendment auditors, adding voice commentary, memes and sound effects to completely transform the original work into a Fair Use Video. In addition, I used a fraction of the original content and transformed the original content into my own unique work. No reasonable person could watch my video and mistake it for the original. Moreover, I am willing to defend myself in a court of law, having hired an attorney to litigate the erroneous charge lodged by the claimant. Please forward my counter notification to the claimant so he may decide for himself if he chooses to take legal action in defense of his false claim. Thank you.

I swear, under penalty of perjury, that I have a good faith belief the material was removed due to a mistake or misidentification of the material to be removed or disabled.

I consent to the jurisdiction of the Federal District Court for the district in which my address is located, or if my address is outside of the United States, the judicial district in which YouTube is located, and will accept service of process from the claimant.

Gail Buma

Gail Buma
4 Ashley Drive

Delran, New Jersey 08075
United States

gailbuma3@gmail.com

(856) 296-1727

[Help Center](#) • [Email Options](#)

You received this email to provide information and updates around your YouTube channel or account.



© 2021 [Google LLC d/b/a YouTube, 901 Cherry Ave, San Bruno, CA 94066](#)



Re: [J46MOTK4CTOQLM2SQ34AWU2TDI] New Copyright Counter Notification

From YouTube Copyright <youtube-disputes+10ehyguikeetk0h@google.com>

Date Sat 9/21/2024 4:15 PM

To zkueker88@gmail.com <zkueker88@gmail.com>



We received a counter notification (below) in response to a copyright removal request that you submitted. A counter notification is a legal request for YouTube to reinstate a video that was removed due to a copyright removal request.

You have **10 US business days** to reply to this counter notification. Your response **must include evidence that you've taken legal action against the uploader** to keep the content from being reinstated to YouTube. Usually, evidence would include a lawsuit against the uploader, which names the YouTube URL(s) at issue and seeks a court order to restrain the alleged infringement.

Evidence should be submitted by replying directly to this email. Do not send your reply to copyright@youtube.com.

After 10 US business days, if we don't get a response from you, the content at issue may be reinstated to YouTube. You can find more information about the legal action you must take and what evidence is acceptable in our [Help Center](#).

- The YouTube Team

Counter Notification as follows:

Videos included in counter notification:

- <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=a-unkxptlMA>

Display name of uploader: Dr. Dave Debunker of Frauditors!

My video should be reinstated because it falls under The Fair Use Act of 1976. Furthermore, I have researched copyright law extensively and YouTube cannot determine what is Fair Use and what is not. Only a duly appointed Judge can make that determination, and I am prepared to go to court to challenge this claim. In accordance with The Fair Use Act of 1976, I am legally permitted to create this type of video. I operate a commentary channel where I provide reviews of videos by 1st Amendment auditors, adding voice commentary, memes and sound effects to completely transform the original work into a Fair Use Video. Furthermore, my

video falls under Fair Use due to use of criticism, review, caricature and parody. In addition, I used a fraction of the original content and transformed the original content into my own unique work. No reasonable person could watch my video and mistake it for the original. Moreover, I am willing to defend myself in a court of law, having hired an attorney to litigate the erroneous charge lodged by the claimant. Please forward my counter notification to the claimant so he may decide for himself if he chooses to take legal action in defense of his false claim. Thank you.

I swear, under penalty of perjury, that I have a good faith belief the material was removed due to a mistake or misidentification of the material to be removed or disabled.

I consent to the jurisdiction of the Federal District Court for the district in which my address is located, or if my address is outside of the United States, the judicial district in which YouTube is located, and will accept service of process from the claimant.

Gail Buma

Gail Buma
4 Ashley Drive
Delran, New Jersey 08075
United States

gailbuma3@gmail.com

(856) 296-1727

[Help Center](#) • [Email Options](#)

You received this email to provide information and updates around your YouTube channel or account.



© 2021 [Google LLC d/b/a YouTube, 901 Cherry Ave, San Bruno, CA 94066](#)



Re: [WSULUOAZ3LEHPXFEH2MRWXIKW4] New Copyright Counter Notification

From YouTube Copyright <youtube-disputes+3097i4t6tp5fe0h@google.com>

Date Sat 9/21/2024 1:56 AM

To zkueker88@gmail.com <zkueker88@gmail.com>



We received a counter notification (below) in response to a copyright removal request that you submitted. A counter notification is a legal request for YouTube to reinstate a video that was removed due to a copyright removal request.

You have **10 US business days** to reply to this counter notification. Your response **must include evidence that you've taken legal action against the uploader** to keep the content from being reinstated to YouTube. Usually, evidence would include a lawsuit against the uploader, which names the YouTube URL(s) at issue and seeks a court order to restrain the alleged infringement.

Evidence should be submitted by replying directly to this email. Do not send your reply to copyright@youtube.com.

After 10 US business days, if we don't get a response from you, the content at issue may be reinstated to YouTube. You can find more information about the legal action you must take and what evidence is acceptable in our [Help Center](#).

- The YouTube Team

Counter Notification as follows:

Videos included in counter notification:

- <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Xcj7eozlgyQ>

Display name of uploader: Dr. Dave Debunker of Frauditors!

My video should be reinstated because it falls under The Fair Use Act of 1976. Furthermore, I have researched copyright law extensively and YouTube cannot determine what is Fair Use and what is not. Only a duly appointed Judge can make that determination, and I am prepared to go to court to challenge this claim. In accordance with The Fair Use Act of 1976, I am legally permitted to create this type of video. I operate a commentary channel where I provide reviews of videos by 1st Amendment auditors, adding voice commentary, memes and sound effects to completely transform the original work into a Fair Use Video. Furthermore, my

video falls under Fair Use due to use of criticism, review, caricature and parody. In addition, I used a fraction of the original content and transformed the original content into my own unique work. No reasonable person could watch my video and mistake it for the original. Moreover, I am willing to defend myself in a court of law, having hired an attorney to litigate the erroneous charge lodged by the claimant. Please forward my counter notification to the claimant so he may decide for himself if he chooses to take legal action in defense of his false claim. Thank you.

I swear, under penalty of perjury, that I have a good faith belief the material was removed due to a mistake or misidentification of the material to be removed or disabled.

I consent to the jurisdiction of the Federal District Court for the district in which my address is located, or if my address is outside of the United States, the judicial district in which YouTube is located, and will accept service of process from the claimant.

Gail Buma

Gail Buma
4 Ashley Drive
Delran, New Jersey 08075
United States

gailbuma3@gmail.com

(856) 296-1727

[Help Center](#) • [Email Options](#)

You received this email to provide information and updates around your YouTube channel or account.



© 2021 [Google LLC d/b/a YouTube, 901 Cherry Ave, San Bruno, CA 94066](#)



Re: [AED5AZF3PF2UHIWGN7HHEQH2D4] New Copyright Counter Notification

From YouTube Copyright <youtube-disputes+3fw84a6b7q9l00h@google.com>

Date Wed 9/25/2024 8:29 PM

To zkueker88@gmail.com <zkueker88@gmail.com>



We received a counter notification (below) in response to a [copyright removal request](#) that you submitted. A counter notification is a legal request for YouTube to reinstate a video that was removed due to a copyright removal request.

You have **10 US business days** to reply to this counter notification. Your response **must include evidence that you've taken legal action against the uploader** to keep the content from being reinstated to YouTube. Usually, evidence would include a lawsuit against the uploader, which names the YouTube URL(s) at issue and seeks a court order to restrain the alleged infringement.

Evidence should be submitted by replying directly to this email. Do not send your reply to copyright@youtube.com.

After 10 US business days, if we don't get a response from you, the content at issue may be reinstated to YouTube. You can find more information about the legal action you must take and what evidence is acceptable in our [Help Center](#).

- The YouTube Team

Counter Notification as follows:

Videos included in counter notification:

- <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TI6OVNs0ua8>

Display name of uploader: Dr. Dave Debunker of Frauditors!

My video should be reinstated because it falls under The Fair Use Act of 1976. Furthermore, I have researched copyright law extensively and YouTube cannot determine what is Fair Use and what is not. Only a duly appointed Judge can make that determination, and I am prepared to go to court to challenge this claim. In accordance with The Fair Use Act of 1976, I am legally permitted to create this type of video. I operate a commentary channel where I provide reviews of videos by 1st Amendment auditors, adding voice commentary, memes and sound effects to completely transform the original work into a Fair Use Video. Furthermore, my

video falls under Fair Use due to use of criticism, review, caricature and parody. In addition, I used a fraction of the original content and transformed the original content into my own unique work. No reasonable person could watch my video and mistake it for the original. Moreover, I am willing to defend myself in a court of law, having hired an attorney to litigate the erroneous charge lodged by the claimant. Please forward my counter notification to the claimant so he may decide for himself if he chooses to take legal action in defense of his false claim. Thank you.

I swear, under penalty of perjury, that I have a good faith belief the material was removed due to a mistake or misidentification of the material to be removed or disabled.

I consent to the jurisdiction of the Federal District Court for the district in which my address is located, or if my address is outside of the United States, the judicial district in which YouTube is located, and will accept service of process from the claimant.

Gail Buma

Gail Buma
4 Ashley Drive
Delran, New Jersey 08075
United States

gailbuma3@gmail.com

(856) 296-1727

[Help Center](#) • [Email Options](#)

You received this email to provide information and updates around your YouTube channel or account.



© 2021 [Google LLC d/b/a YouTube, 901 Cherry Ave, San Bruno, CA 94066](#)